



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,913	09/25/2000	Charles Anthony Seiber	76507/273	2604

26371 7590 06/17/2003

FOLEY & LARDNER
777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 3800
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308

EXAMINER

MILLER, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3677

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/669,913	Applicant(s) SEIBER ET AL.
	Examiner William L. Miller	Art Unit 3677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 37,39-47 and 75-85 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 37,39-46,76 and 79-85 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 47,75,77 and 78 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 18, 19. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 05-09-2003 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and/or MPEP § 609 because 1) it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language, specifically foreign citations 2-5; and 2) it does not include a publication date of non-patent literature citations 2-22. The above mentioned references have not been considered as to the merits.
2. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Declaration

3. The supplemental declaration filed 03-17-03 has been entered.

Specification

4. A substitute specification excluding the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because the current specification describes Figs. 1-73E, while the drawings include only Figs. 1-45. A substitute specification filed under 37 CFR 1.125(a) must only contain subject matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37 CFR 1.121. If the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of record, the substitute

specification must be filed under 37 CFR 1.125(b) and must be accompanied by: 1) a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter; and 2) a marked-up copy showing the amendments to be made via the substitute specification relative to the specification at the time the substitute specification is filed.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 37, 39, and 40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,779. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each recite a first pivotal interface (hook) and a second pivotal interface (post).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 79 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. In claims 79 and 80, the phrase "the frame" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 79 and 80 should be amended to each depend directly from claim 78.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 37, 39-46, 76, and 81-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelley (US#4457436).

11. Regarding claim 37, Kelley discloses a mounting structure comprising: a first interface 20 including a first projection forming a retaining slot, namely hook 27; and a second interface 60,62.

12. Regarding claim 39, Kelley discloses a mounting structure comprising: a first interface 20 including a first projection forming a retaining slot via hook 27; and a second interface including a projection 60 and a post 62.

13. Regarding claim 40, the second interface includes a projection 60 and a post 62.

14. Regarding claim 42, the inherent retaining slot of the hook 27 by structural definition includes a retaining profile and terminus.

15. Regarding claim 44, the first interface includes a cap 80, and the second interface is alternatively being viewed as element 62 which includes a base 60.

16. Regarding claim 45, a frame 18 indirectly couples the cap to the base.

17. Regarding claim 76, the first interface includes a cap 80, and the second interface includes a base 18.

18. Regarding claims 81 and 82, the interfaces are "generally" coaxial.

19. Regarding claims 84 and 85, the second interface is disposed below the first interface.

20. Regarding independent claims 37 and 39, although the examiner recognizes Kelley fails to specifically disclose the first and second interface as a "pivotal interface", the display board is not being positively claimed and thus represents the intended use of the mounting structure. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). In this case, the first and second interface disclosed by Kelley are capable of cooperating with a display board which is capable of pivoting relative thereto. Therefore, the first and second interface are each being viewed and labeled as a "pivotal interface".

21. Likewise, regarding claims 41, 43, 46, and 83, the display board is not being positively claimed, and the mounting structure disclosed by Kelley is capable of cooperating with a display board as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

22. Claims 47, 75, 77, and 78 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

23. Claims 79 and 80 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Miller whose telephone number is 703 305 3978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. J. Swann can be reached on 703 306 4115. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9326 for regular communications and 703 872 9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 1113.

William L. Miller
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3677



wlm
June 12, 2003